



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,385	07/12/2002	Gregor Kohlruess	KOHLRUSS ET AL-8 PCT	2398
25889	7590	03/10/2005	EXAMINER	
WILLIAM COLLARD COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD ROSLYN, NY 11576			BAHTA, ABRAHAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1775	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/089,385

Applicant(s)

KOHLRUSS ET AL.

Examiner

Abraham Bahta

Art Unit

1775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1775

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 4,439,363.

DE '363 teaches a textile cloth for wiping floors which is detachably affixed to a tenting frame wherein the cloth is at least partially protruding laterally beyond the holding surface (plate) and being tightened at the edge of the plate and the edge is reinforced by means of a rubber profile (2) sewn in by means of a seam so that the edge forms a stable inner frame for accommodating the plate. See English Translation of DE '363 page 4 last paragraph through page 5 last paragraph.

Although, DE '363 does not require strips of felt, the fact remains that the reference on page 3, second paragraph teaches the rubber strips may be sewn to the textile covering and that this permits wringing out the textile covering. See page 3, second paragraph. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed the desired reinforcing strips including, for example, felt so that the felt may be used to remove scuff marks when rubbed against the marks without scratching the

Art Unit: 1775

surface to be cleaned. Further, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended uses as a matter of obvious design choice.

Claim 18: DE 363 teaches the rubber profile may be sewn. See Abstract.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 4,439,363 in view of DE 909,549 as applied to claims 15-16 and 18-19 and further in view of Applicant's prior art admission.

DE '363 and 549 are discussed above. The references do not teach the reinforcing material may be glued to the wiping cloth; however, DE '549 on page 8, paragraph 3 teaches different fabrics and strips of the textile covering can be attached to one another by gluing and the applicant on page 3, line 7 admits it is known to fold the edges of a cloth for wiping floors over and onto the upper side, and to secure the edges there by gluing them to the upper side.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have glued the reinforcing strip to the wiping cloth in order to enhance the mechanical strength or dimensional stability of the wiping cloth with the reinforcing material.

Response to Applicant's Arguments/Remarks

Applicant's arguments filed 12/16/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1775

With respect to DE '363 the applicant argues that the reference does not disclose or suggest the use of felt strips and that the rubber profile of the reference is relatively tough and makes mechanical wringing difficult and cannot easily be sewn together with the textile cover. The Examiner contends that although the DE '363 reference does not specifically mention use of felt strips; however, the fact remains that reference at on page 3, second paragraph teaches the rubber may be sewn to the textile covering and that this permits wringing out the textile covering. Thus, it is within the judgment of the skilled artisan to employ the desired reinforcing strips including, for example, felt so that the felt may be used to remove scuffmarks when rubbed against the marks without scratching the surface to be cleaned.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1775

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abraham Bahta whose telephone number is (571) 272-1352. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday; 11:30 am - 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571) 272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



A. Bahta
03/01/05


JOHN KIM
SUPERVISORY EXAMINER
GROUP 1700